REMARKS

Present Status of Patent Application

It is noted with a great appreciation that the Office Action deems Claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 17-19 allowable. Further, the Office Action also deems Claim 13 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten into an independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-11, 13-19 remain pending, of which claims 11 and 16 have been amended, and claims 3 and 13 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, to more clearly describe the claimed invention. More specifically, a subject matter of claim 13 has been incorporated into independent Claim 11, and Claim 13 has been amended to replace the term "upper electrode" to –lower electrode—because of obvious typographical error, for example, please refer to FIG. 4 and page 10, lines 3-5 of specification, where it is described that the gate terminal 402 not only serves as a scan line, but also serves as a lower electrode of the capacitor. Accordingly, the amendment to Claim 16 is fully supported by the specification. It is believed that no new matter adds by way of these amendments made to the claims, or to the application. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 14-19 patently define over the prior art of record. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Response to Claims Rejections under 35 USC§112

The Examiner objected to Claims 3 and 16, on page 2 of the Office Action mailed February 20, 2004, under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being redundant of Claim 1, AND claim being unclear as to whether the lower electrode is a portion of gate terminal or the switching element.

In response thereto, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for pointing out the informalities, and accordingly canceled Claim 3 and amended Claim 16. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Response to Claims Rejections under 35 USC§102

The Office Action rejected claims 11 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), as being anticipated by Applicant's prior art figures 1, 2A and 2B (hereinafter AAPA).

In rejecting the above claims, the Office Action stated that Figures 1, 2A and 2B of AAPA discloses a liquid crystal display device, which is similar to the claimed invention, and therefore AAPA anticipates the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the above rejections as set forth below. Independent Claim 1, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that AAPA fails to disclose or teach every features of the claim 1. More specifically, AAPA at least fails to disclose or teach a liquid crystal display comprising at least ***"the pixel electrode has a protruding section electrically connected to the upper electrode of the storage capacitor, wherein the protruding section can be detached from the pixel electrode, as required by the amended Claim 11".*** The advantage of the pixel electrode layer serving as an upper electrode of the storage capacitor is that the storage capacitor can continue to function as a storage capacitor to maintain required capacitance for normal operation and also that the repaired pixel does not form a point defect. Therefore, the image quality can be substantially promoted.

To the contrary, AAPA substantially discloses that the pixel electrode layer 118 is electrically connected to the upper electrode 116 through the opening 120. [The connection between the pixel electrode layer 118 and the upper electrode 116 is via a protruding section of

the upper electrode 116, not a protruding section of the pixel electrode layer 118]. In other words, AAPA substantially fails to disclose or teach that the pixel electrode layer 118 has a protruding section (please see FIG. 2A) and as shown in FIG. 2B, and fails to show that the protruding section can be detached from the pixel electrode 118.

In other words, AAPA substantially fails to disclose that the pixel electrode 118 has a protruding section electrically connected to the upper electrode of the storage capacitor (please see FIG. 3B), instead substantially discloses the upper electrode 116 has a protruding section electrically connected to the upper electrode 116 (please see FIG. 2B).

Further, AAPA also substantially fails to disclose or teach that the protruding section can be detached from the pixel electrode as proposed by the amended Claim 11 of the Claimed invention, instead AAPA substantially disclose or teach that in most cases the design engineers prefer not repairing the defective capacitor and leave the defective capacitor as is, which forms a point defect (please see page 3, lines 20-21).

Accordingly, it is clearly evident that AAPA substantially fails to disclose that the pixel electrode (118) comprises a protruding section electrically connected to the upper electrode of the storage capacitor, wherein the protruding section can be detached from the pixel electrode (118), as recited by the amended Claim 11 of the Claimed invention. Consequently, the storage capacitor can continue to function as storage capacitor and also that the repaired pixel does not form a point defect.

Further, because Claims 14-16 depend from independent claim 11, therefore Claims 14-16 also patently define over AAPA. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all pending claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 14-19 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS

Date: 4/19/2004

Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949) 660-0809